



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
P.O. Box 1450  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

JGJR.: 06-04

Paper No: 9

NOVOZYMES NORTH AMERICA, INC.  
500 FIFTH AVENUE  
SUITE 1600  
NEW YORK NY 10110

**COPY MAILED**  
**JUL 02 2004**  
**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

In re Application of  
Outrup, et al.  
Application No. 09/931,701  
Filing Date: 16 August, 2001  
Attorney Docket No. 10065.200-US

DECISION ON PETITION

This is a decision on the petition filed on 28 June, 2004, alleging, *inter alia*, unintentional delay under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b), and in light of the record and the allegations considered under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) as an allegation of unavoidable delay.

For the reasons set forth below:

- the petition as considered under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) is **GRANTED**, and the fee (\$110.00) is charged to Deposit Account 50-1701, as authorized; and
- the petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) is **DISMISSED as moot**.

**BACKGROUND**

The record reflects that:

- Petitioner failed to reply timely and properly to the Notice of Missing Parts mailed on 23 October, 2001, with reply due absent extension of time on or before 24 December, 2001;
- the application went abandoned by operation of law after midnight 23 December, 2001;
- the Office mailed a Notice of Abandonment on 4 December, 2003;

- previously, Petitioner submitted a copy of a reply alleged to have been submitted on 9 January, 2002, over an 18 December, 2001, certificate of mail, however, it is clear from the copies of the papers submitted and the instant petition that all of these materials were misfiled by Petitioner into the wrong application, and the request to withdraw the holding of abandonment was dismissed;
- in the instant petition Petitioner makes the statement of unintentional delay, authorizes fees, and the reply previously was submitted, however, the petition also is considered in light of events as one under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a), and there is a showing of unavoidable delay.

### STATUTES, REGULATIONS AND ANALYSIS

Congress has authorized the Commissioner to "revive an application if the delay is shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner to have been "unavoidable." 35 U.S.C. §133 (1994).<sup>1</sup>

The regulations at 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) and (b) set forth the requirements for a petitioner to revive a previously unavoidably or unintentionally, respectively, abandoned application under this congressional grant of authority. The language of 35 U.S.C. §133 and 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) is clear, unambiguous, and without qualification: the delay in tendering the reply to the outstanding Office action, as well as filing the first petition seeking revival, must have been unavoidable for the reply now to be accepted on petition.<sup>2</sup>

Delays in responding properly raise the question whether delays are unavoidable.<sup>3</sup> Where there is a question whether the delay was unavoidable, Petitioners must meet the burden of establishing that the delay was unavoidable within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §133 and 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a).<sup>4</sup> And the Petitioner must be diligent in attending to the matter.<sup>5</sup> Failure to do so does not

---

<sup>1</sup> 35 U.S.C. §133 provides:

**35 U.S.C. §133 Time for prosecuting application.**

Upon failure of the applicant to prosecute the application within six months after any action therein, of which notice has been given or mailed to the applicant, or within such shorter time, not less than thirty days, as fixed by the Commissioner in such action, the application shall be regarded as abandoned by the parties thereto, unless it be shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that such delay was unavoidable.

<sup>2</sup> Therefore, by example, an unavoidable delay in the payment of the Filing Fee might occur if a reply is shipped by the US Postal Service, but due to catastrophic accident, the delivery is not made.

<sup>3</sup> See: *Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure; Final Rule Notice*, 62 Fed. Reg. at 53158-59 (October 10, 1997), 1203 *Off. Gaz. Pat. Office* at 86-87 (October 21, 1997).

<sup>4</sup> See: *In re Application of G*, 11 USPQ2d 1378, 1380 (Comm'r Pats. 1989).

<sup>5</sup> See: Diligence in Filing Petitions to Revive and Petitions to Withdraw the Holding of Abandonment, 1124 *Off. Gaz. Pat. Office* 33 (March 19, 1991). It was and is Petitioner's burden to exercise diligence in seeking either to have the holding of abandonment withdrawn or the application revived. See 1124 *Off. Gaz. Pat. Office* *supra*.

constitute the care required under Pratt, and so cannot satisfy the test for diligence and due care.

By contrast, unintentional delays are those that do not satisfy the very strict statutory and regulatory requirements of unavoidable delay, and also, by definition, are not intentional.<sup>6</sup> And petitions calling upon the authority of the Commissioner to act, such as that under 37 C.F.R. §1.181,<sup>7</sup> require diligence as to their filing—i.e., the petition must be filed within two months of the action complained of.

#### Allegations as to Unavoidable Delay and Unintentional Delay

Petitioner has evidenced that, while he did in fact err in entering the application number on the papers submitted, he was diligent in his reply to the Office action in question, though the reply was filed into the wrong application. Petitioner has made a showing of unavoidable delay.

Thus, Petitioner has satisfied his burden under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a).

#### CONCLUSION

Therefore, the petition as considered under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) hereby is **granted**, and the

---

<sup>6</sup> Therefore, by example, an unintentional delay in the reply might occur if the reply and transmittal form are to be prepared for shipment by the US Postal Service, but other pressing matters distract one's attention and the mail is not timely deposited for shipment.

<sup>7</sup> The regulations at 37 C.F.R. §1.181 provide:

**§ 1.181 Petition to the Commissioner.**

(a) Petition may be taken to the Commissioner:

(1) From any action or requirement of any examiner in the *ex parte* prosecution of an application, or in the *ex parte* or *inter partes* prosecution of a reexamination proceeding which is not subject to appeal to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences or to the court;

(2) In cases in which a statute or the rules specify that the matter is to be determined directly by or reviewed by the Commissioner; and

(3) To invoke the supervisory authority of the Commissioner in appropriate circumstances. For petitions in interferences, see § 1.644.

(b) Any such petition must contain a statement of the facts involved and the point or points to be reviewed and the action requested. Briefs or memoranda, if any, in support thereof should accompany or be embodied in the petition; and where facts are to be proven, the proof in the form of affidavits or declarations (and exhibits, if any) must accompany the petition.

(c) When a petition is taken from an action or requirement of an examiner in the *ex parte* prosecution of an application, or in the *ex parte* or *inter partes* prosecution of a reexamination proceeding, it may be required that there have been a proper request for reconsideration (§ 1.111) and a repeated action by the examiner. The examiner may be directed by the Commissioner to furnish a written statement, within a specified time, setting forth the reasons for his or her decision upon the matters averred in the petition, supplying a copy to the petitioner.

(d) Where a fee is required for a petition to the Commissioner the appropriate section of this part will so indicate. If any required fee does not accompany the petition, the petition will be dismissed.

(e) Oral hearing will not be granted except when considered necessary by the Commissioner.

(f) The mere filing of a petition will not stay any period for reply that may be running against the application, nor act as a stay of other proceedings. Any petition under this part not filed within two months of the mailing date of the action or notice from which relief is requested may be dismissed as untimely, except as otherwise provided. This two-month period is not extendable.

(g) The Commissioner may delegate to appropriate Patent and Trademark Office officials the determination of petitions.

[24 Fed. Reg. 10332, Dec. 22, 1959; 34 Fed. Reg. 18857, Nov. 26, 1969; paras. (d) and (g), 47 Fed. Reg. 41278, Sept. 17, 1982, effective Oct. 1, 1982; para. (a), 49 Fed. Reg. 48416, Dec. 12, 1984, effective Feb. 11, 1985; para. (f) revised, 65 Fed. Reg. 54604, Sept. 8, 2000, effective Nov. 7, 2000; paras. (a) and (c) revised, 65 Fed. Reg. 76756, Dec. 7, 2000, effective Feb. 5, 2001]

petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) hereby is **dismissed as moot**.

The instant file is forwarded to Technology Center 1600 for further processing in due course.

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision may be directed to the undersigned at (703) 305-9199.



John J. Gillon, Jr.  
Senior Attorney  
Office of Petitions